

A Nominating and Elections Committee has been designated as a standing committee. It will combine the functions of the present separate Nominating and Elections Committees under by-law amendments yet to be submitted.¹

No comments have been received and none were solicited except through circulation of the By-Law amendment notice.

No burden on competition will be imposed by the proposed amendment.

The Exchange's Basis and Purpose under the Act for the Proposed Rule Change

The amendments enhance the ability of the Exchange to carry out the purposes of the Securities Exchange Act and to enforce compliance with the Act and with its own rules (Act, Sec. 6(b)(1)); and to provide a fair procedure for denial of membership or the prohibition or limitation of any person with respect to access to services offered by the Exchange (Act, Sec. 6(b)(7)).

Within 35 days of the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register (December 8, 1980), or within such longer period (i) as the Commission may designate up to 90 days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the above-mentioned self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission will:

- (a) by order approve such proposed rule change, or
- (b) institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing. Persons desiring to make written submissions should file 6 copies thereof with the Secretary of the Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C. 20549. Copies of the filing with respect to the foregoing and of all written submissions will be available for inspection and copying in the Public Reference Room, 1100 "L" Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the above mentioned self-regulatory organization. All submissions should refer to the file number

¹ By-Law sections affected by the amendments are as follows: 5-3; 10-1(a); 10-3(a); 10-3(c); 10-6 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f); 12-4 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h); 12-5; 15-1; 15-2; 17-1; 17-5; 17-6; 10-7 (a), (b), (c); 10-14; 10-10 (a), (b), (c); 10-12; 10-15; present sections 10-17, 10-8, 10-10, 10-12, and 10-15 shall be renumbered sections 10-8, 10-9, 10-11, 10-13, 10-14, respectively.

referenced in the caption above and should be submitted within 21 days of the date of this publication.

For the Commission by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

October 27, 1980.

George A. Fitzsimmons,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 80-34005 Filed 10-31-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Region IX Advisory Council Meeting; Public Meeting

The Small Business Administration Region IX Advisory Council, located in the geographical area of Los Angeles, California, will hold a public meeting at 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, November 19, 1980, at the World Trade Center, 350 South Figueroa, Suite 600, Los Angeles, California, to discuss such matters as may be presented by members, the staff of the U.S. Small Business Administration, and others attending.

For further information, write or call Rudolph I. Estrada, District Director, U.S. Small Business Administration, 350 S. Figueroa, Suite 600, Los Angeles, California 90071—(213) 688-2977.

Dated: October 27, 1980.

Michael B. Kraft,

Deputy Advocate for Advisory Councils.

[FR Doc. 80-34231 Filed 10-31-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

[Proposed License No. 09/09-0271]

Small Business Enterprise Associates; Application for a License to Operate as a Small Business Investment Company

Notice is hereby given of the filing of an application with the Small Business Administration pursuant to Section 107.102 of the Regulations governing small business investment companies (CFR 107.102(1980)) by Small Business Enterprise Associates, a limited partnership, Suite 2170, 555 California Street, San Francisco, California 94104, for a license to operate as a small business investment company under the provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended (Act), (15 U.S.C. et seq.).

The proposed General Partner, individual General Partners, and Limited Partners:

General Partner

Merrill, Pickard & Company, 555 California Street, Suite 2170, San Francisco, California 94104.

Individual General Partners

Steven L. Merrill, 555 California Street, Suite 2170, San Francisco, California 94104.

W. Jeffers Pickard, 555 California Street, Suite 2170, San Francisco, California 94104.

Limited Partners

Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association, 555 California Street, Suite 2170, San Francisco, California 94104.

The limited partner, Bank of America NT&SA, is a national bank and a wholly-owned subsidiary of BankAmerica Corporation.

The general partner is a California partnership, which will consist of three to five general partners, including Steven L. Merrill as managing general partner and W. Jeffers Richard as general partner. The other general partners will be selected at a later date.

BankAmerica Capital Investments, Inc., also a wholly-owned subsidiary of BankAmerica Corporation, and the general partner of the Applicant, Merrill, Pickard & Company, will be the sole limited and sole general partner respectively of another proposed California limited partnership, Five-Percent Partners, 555 California Street, Suite 2170, San Francisco, California 94104, a non-SBIC. The purpose of Five-Percent Partners will be to provide investment funds to companies that do not qualify for investment by an SBIC limited partnership.

Applicant intends to follow a diversified investment policy with emphasis on "venture capital" investments in "small business concerns" as those terms are defined in § 107.3 of the Regulations. The limited partner will contribute initially to the Applicant certain portfolio securities having a market value of approximately \$11 million (cost about \$10 million). At least \$500,000 will be cash. In addition, the limited partner and BankAmerica Capital Investments, Inc., will commit additional cash as needed up to a maximum amount of \$15 million between the Applicant and Five-Percent Partners. While it is not possible to determine at this time the eventual distribution of the additional cash between the two proposed partnerships, it is assumed it will be divided equally.

Matters involved in SBA's consideration of the application include (1) the general business reputation and character of the proposed owners and management, (2) the reasonable prospects for successful operation of the new SBIC under such management (including adequate profitability and

financial soundness, in accordance with the Act and Regulations), and (3) whether the proposed licensing would be in the furtherance of the purpose of the Act.

Notice is hereby given that any person may not later than (15 days from date of publication of this Notice) submit written comments to the Acting Associate Administrator for Investment, 1441 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20416.

A copy of this notice will be published in a newspaper of general circulation in San Francisco, California.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 59.011, Small Business Investment Companies)

Dated: October 27, 1980.

Peter F. McNeish,

Acting Associate Administrator for Investment.

[FR Doc. 80-34230 Filed 10-31-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

[Declaration of Disaster Loan Area No. 1905; Amdt. No. 1]

Virginia; Declaration of Disaster Loan Area

The above numbered Declaration (see 45 FR 61060), is amended by adding the following counties:

County, Natural Disaster(s), and Date(s)

Augusta—Drought—5/15/80 to 9/9/80.
Bedford—Drought—5/27/80 to 9/4/80.
Brunswick—Drought—5/20/80 to 8/19/80.
Campbell—Drought—5/26/80 to 8/19/80.
Charlotte—Drought—6/1/80 to 8/22/80.
Clarke—Drought—6/1/80 to 8/31/80.
Culpeper—Drought—5/15/80 to 8/15/80.
Fairfax—Drought—7/1/80 to 8/31/80.
Fauquier—Drought—5/20/80 to 9/10/80.
Franklin—Drought—5/20/80 to 8/19/80.
Frederick—Drought—5/20/80 to 8/19/80;
Hail, 6/3/80.
Greene—Drought—6/1/80 to 9/4/80.
Greensville—Drought—5/20/80 to 9/9/80.
Halifax—Drought—6/15/80 to 9/5/80.
Henry—Drought—7/1/80 to 8/31/80.
Loudoun—Drought—7/1/80 to 8/31/80.
Lunenburg—Drought—5/20/80 to 8/14/80.
Madison—Drought—5/20/80 to 8/19/80.
Mecklinburg—Drought—5/1/80 to 9/5/80.
Nottoway—Drought—5/20/80 to 9/2/80.
Page—Drought—5/20/80 to 9/8/80.
Patrick—Drought—6/1/80 to 8/31/80.
Pittsylvania—Drought—7/1/80 to 9/9/80.
Prince Edward—Drought—5/20/80 to 9/8/80.
Prince William—Drought—5/20/80 to 9/10/80.
Rockbridge—Drought—6/1/80 to 9/8/80.
Rockingham—Drought—5/20/80 to 9/8/80.
Shenandoah—Drought—5/20/80 to 7/18/80.
Warren—Drought—5/20/80 to 9/9/80.

and adjacent counties within the State of Virginia and independent cities within the declared counties and independent cities within the adjacent counties as a result of natural disaster

as indicated. All other information remains the same i.e., the termination date for filing application for physical damage is close of business on March 5, 1981, and for economic injury until the close of business on June 5, 1981.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008)

Dated: October 8, 1980.

A. Vernon Weaver,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 80-34232 Filed 10-31-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Minority Business Resource Center Advisory Committee; Meeting

Pursuant to Section 19(a) and (2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463; 5 U.S.C. App. I), notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Minority Business Resource Center Advisory Committee to be held November 13, 1980, at 10:00 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. at the Department of Transportation, 400 7th Street, S.W., Room 6434, Washington, D.C. 20590. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

- Capital Formation/MESBIC Status
- LOC Focus—FY-81
- Clearinghouse System—Status
- Open Discussion

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to the space available. With the approval of the Chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to attend and persons wishing to present oral statements should notify the Minority Business Resource Center not later than the day before the meeting. Information pertaining to the meeting may be obtained from Ms. Betty Chandler, Advisory Committee Staff Assistant, Minority Business Resource Center, Office of the Secretary, 400 7th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590, telephone: (202) 426-2852. Any member of the public may present a written statement to the Committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on October 28, 1980.

Earl D. Proctor,

Executive Director, Minority Business Resource Center.

[FR Doc. 80-34138 Filed 10-31-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-M

Research and Special Programs Administration

National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc.: Application for Inconsistency Ruling; Public Notice and Invitation to Comment

AGENCY: Materials Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Public notice and invitation to comment.

SUMMARY: The National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc. (NTTC) has applied for an administrative ruling as to whether certain provisions of House Bill No. 1870 passed by the Legislature of the State of Washington which impose certain shipping paper requirements for the transportation of hazardous materials are inconsistent with and thus preempted by the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA) and regulations issued thereunder.

DATES: Comments received on or before January 9, 1981 will be considered before an inconsistency ruling is issued by the Associate Director for Operations and Enforcement.

ADDRESSES: The NTTC's application and any comments received may be reviewed in the Dockets Branch, Office of Public Affairs and Consumer Participation, Division of Public Information, Room 8426, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. Comments on the above application must be submitted to the Dockets Branch at the above address. Five copies are requested. A copy of each comment must also be sent to Mr. Clifford J. Harvison, Managing Director, National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 "P" Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, and that fact certified at the time the comment is submitted to the Dockets Branch. (The following format is suggested: "I hereby certify that a copy of this comment has been sent to Mr. Clifford J. Harvison at the address noted in the Federal Register publication.")

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Beatriz V. Ferreira, Office of the Chief Counsel, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590, (phone (202) 755-4972).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Background

The HMTA (49 U.S.C. 1801-1812) at section 112(a) (49 U.S.C. 1811(a)) expressly preempts "any requirement of a State or political subdivision thereof, which is inconsistent with any requirement", of the HMTA or

regulations issued thereunder. Section 112(b) (49 U.S.C. 1811(b)) provides that an inconsistent State or political subdivision requirement ceases to be preempted, however, if upon application the Secretary of DOT determines that the requirement in question (1) provides an equal or greater level of protection to the public than the HMTA or regulations issued under the HMTA and (2) does not unreasonably burden commerce.

Procedural regulations implementing section 112 of the HMTA are codified at 49 CFR 107.201-225. These regulations provide for the issuance of inconsistency rulings and non-preemption determinations. Briefly, an inconsistency ruling is an administrative opinion as to the relationship between a State or political subdivision requirement and a requirement of the HMTA or regulations issued under the HMTA. 49 CFR 107.209(c) sets forth the following factors which are considered in determining whether a State or political subdivision requirement is inconsistent:

(1) Whether compliance with both State or political subdivision requirement and the Act or the regulations issued under the Act is possible; and

(2) The extent to which the State or political subdivision requirement is an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the Act and the regulations issued under the Act.

If the State or local requirement is found to be inconsistent with a Federal requirement, the State or locality may seek a non-preemption determination, i.e., a waiver of preemption pursuant to section 112(b) of the HMTA (49 U.S.C. 1811(b)).

2. National Tank Truck Carriers' Application for Inconsistency Ruling

On July 1, 1980, the National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc. of Washington, D.C. filed an application for an administrative ruling as to whether certain shipping paper requirements passed on March 3, 1980 by the Legislature of the State of Washington pertaining to the transportation of hazardous materials are inconsistent with the requirements of the HMTA or regulations issued under the HMTA. The NTTC is a national and international trade association of the for-hire tank truck industry.

Applicable segments of the Washington requirement, entitled House Bill No. 1870, are included as Appendix A to this document. The shipping paper provision passed by the Washington Legislature applies where hazardous materials are transported by motor vehicle within the State of Washington.

The State requires that any common motor carrier receiving a hazardous material, as defined in 49 CFR 172, for transportation within the State shall issue a receipt or bill of lading, which is red in color or has a red border. The bill also empowers the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to promulgate regulations and provides for enforcement and civil penalties.

Briefly, the NTTC contends that the State requirement fails to offer an equal or greater level of protection to the public than the Federal requirement and unreasonably burdens (interstate) commerce because interstate carriers affected by the State requirement would have to "duplicate administrative and operational procedures" in order to comply with the State requirement. The NTTC additionally argues that such regulations may "create a false sense of security" at an accident scene and cause "dangerous confusion" among emergency personnel trained in commonly-used hazard warning systems. Further, the NTTC contends that the State requirement holds great potential for direct conflict with the shipping requirements set forth at 49 CFR 172.200 and 172.201(a)(1)(ii). Section 172.200 requires that each person who offers hazardous materials for transportation shall describe the hazardous material on the shipping paper in the manner required by Subpart C. Specifically, 49 CFR 172.201(a)(1)(ii) requires that hazardous material description entries specified by § 172.202 and any additional entries specified by § 172.203 must be entered in a color that clearly contrasts with any description of a material not subject to the requirements of Subchapter C. Section 107.201 also permits such entries to be entered *first* on the shipping paper (49 CFR 172.201(a)(1)(i)), or to be identified by the entry of an "X" placed before the proper shipping name in a column captioned "HM" (49 CFR 172.201(a)(1)(iii)).

Pursuant to 49 CFR 107.205(a), the Attorney General's office for the State of Washington has submitted comments regarding NTTC's application for inconsistency ruling. Essentially, the State of Washington advocates rejection of NTTC's application based on the argument that the red or red-bordered bills of lading apply only to intrastate common carriers and do not affect interstate carriers. Further, the State argues that even if the State requirement affects interstate carriers, it affords a greater level of protection than the Federal requirements and does not unreasonably burden commerce. (section 112(B), 49 U.S.C. 1811(b))

Finally, the State asserts that the "red or red-bordered" requirement is additional to any Federal requirement; does not interfere with Federal compliance and is in furtherance of the policy of the HMTA, i.e., to protect "against the risks of life and property which are inherent in the transportation of hazardous materials in commerce."

3. Public Comment.

Comments should be restricted to the following issue: whether Washington's requirement that a receipt, manifest, or bill of lading issued for hazardous materials be red or have a red border is inconsistent with the HMTA or regulations issued thereunder.

Since the NTTC's application is for an inconsistency ruling and not a non-preemption determination, comments on the effect on interstate commerce of Washington's requirement as the effect relates to a waiver of preemption under 49 U.S.C. 1811(b), are inappropriate at this time and will not be considered.

Persons intending to comment on the application submitted by NTTC should examine the HMTA (49 U.S.C. 1801-1812), the DOT Hazardous Materials Regulations (49 CFR Parts 171-179), and the procedures governing the Department's consideration of applications for inconsistency rulings (49 CFR 107.201-211) as well as the Washington requirement contained in the Appendix to this Notice.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on October 23, 1980.

Alan I. Roberts,

Associate Director, Office of Hazardous Materials Regulation.

Appendix A.—Excerpts of House Bill No. 1870

State of Washington, 96th Legislature, 1980
Regular Session

By: Representatives Sherman, Martinis,
Bender, Becker, Walk, Keller and Charnley

Read first time January 22, 1980, and referred to Committee on Transportation, An Act Relating to common carriers; amending section 81.29.020, chapter 14, Laws of 1961 and RCW 81.29.020; amending section 81.80.230, Chapter 14, Laws of 1961 and RCW 81.80.230; amending section 81.80.230, chapter 14, Laws of 1961 and RCW 81.80.330; and providing an effective date.

Be it Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Washington: Section 1. * * * If the receipt, manifest or bill of lading is for hazardous material, as defined in 49 CFR Part 172, transported by motor vehicle upon the public highways of this state, it shall be red in color or shall have a red border. Red bills of lading, receipts or manifests or red bordered bills of lading, receipts or manifests shall only be used for the transportation of hazardous materials as defined in 49 CFR 172.

Section 2. Section 81.80.230, chapter 14, Laws of 1961 and RCW 81.80.230 are each amended to read as follows:

Any person, * * * who shall * * * fraudulently seek to evade or defeat regulation as in this chapter provided for motor carriers shall be * * * subject to a civil penalty of not more than one hundred dollars for each violation. Each and every violation shall be a separate and distinct offense, and in case of a continuing violation every day's continuance shall be a separate and distinct violation. Every act of commission or omission which procures, aids, or abets in the violation shall be considered a violation under this section and subject to the penalty provided for in this section.

The penalty provided for in this section shall become due and payable when the person incurring the penalty receives a notice in writing from the commission describing the violation with reasonable particularity and advising the person that the penalty is due. The commission may, upon written application therefor, receive within fifteen days, remit or mitigate any penalty provided for in this section or discontinue any prosecution to recover the penalty upon such terms as the commission in its discretion deems proper. The commission has authority to ascertain the facts upon all such applications in such manner and under such regulations as it may deem proper. If the penalty is not paid to the commission within fifteen days after receipt of notice imposing the penalty or application for remission or mitigation has not been made within fifteen days after the violator has received notice of the disposition of the application, the attorney general shall bring an action in the name of the state of Washington in the superior court of Thurston County or of some other county in which the violator may do business, to recover the penalty. In all such actions, the procedure and rules of evidence shall be the same as in an ordinary civil action except as otherwise provided in this section. All penalties recovered under this section shall be paid into the state treasury and credited to the public service revolving fund.

Section 3. Section 81.80.330, chapter 14, Laws of 1961 and RCW 81.80.330 are each amended to read as follows:

* * * It shall be the duty of the Washington state patrol and the sheriffs of the counties to make arrests and the county attorneys to prosecute violations of this chapter.

This 1980 act took effect on July 1, 1980.

[FR Doc. 80-33972 Filed 10-31-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Urban Mass Transportation Administration

Public Transportation Alternatives in New York; Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement

In accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act

(NEPA); (83 Stat. 852), the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) implementing regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration's Policy on Major Urban Mass Transportation Investments (published in the *Federal Register* on September 22, 1976), the Urban Mass Transportation Administration hereby gives notice that an analysis of public transportation alternatives between Manhattan, New York and the John F. Kennedy International Airport through the Queens, New York transportation corridor and preparation of related Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements are to begin following a public meeting on November 18, 1980, at which the scope and conduct of the analysis will be discussed. Members of the public and interested Federal, State and local agencies are invited to comment on the proposed scope of work, alternatives to be studied, impacts to be assessed, and evaluation criteria to be used to arrive at a decision. The Scoping Meeting will be held at 7:30 P.M. in Queensboro Hall, 120-55 Queens Boulevard, Queens, New York (November 18, 1980).

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration's Policy on Major Urban Mass Transportation Investments requires an analysis of alternatives to be undertaken if an area is contemplating seeking Federal funding for a major investment. The Policy defines a major investment as any new or extended fixed guideway transit facility. To be eligible for Federal funding, the analysis must be conducted, but completion of the analysis does not ensure that Federal funding will be forthcoming. The subject analysis will be conducted by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, through the Tri-State Regional Planning Commission. The analysis will be under the supervision of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration with the cooperation of the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration.

John F. Kennedy Airport is expected to experience substantial, continued traffic growth in the upcoming years. Ground access to the airport already promises to constrain this future growth. To meet the anticipated travel demand of 35 million air passengers by 1990, improved transportation access between the airport and Manhattan and surrounding areas is a vital necessity. Manhattan is the single largest concentration of air passengers, employees and visitors destined for the airport and the area of highest transit

dependence. Thus, Manhattan is the primary area of interest in the subject analysis, but consideration is also given to public transportation needs from other parts of New York City and from suburban areas.

To accommodate the future demand, 14 alternatives for public transit access from Manhattan to the airport were examined in a preliminary analysis. The capital cost of these alternatives ranged from nominal sums to almost \$500 million for the most extensive construction proposals.

As a result of preliminary community meetings, staff analysis and preliminary review by the involved local transportation agencies, four of the 14 alternatives examined in the preliminary analysis are proposed for further evaluation in the subject analysis. These alternatives, each of which is estimated to cost less than \$200 million, include:

1. Null (Do Nothing)—Continuation of the current public transportation services such as the Airport Coach service operated by Carey Transportation and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority's JFK Express subway-bus from Manhattan to the airport. In this and other alternatives, other airport-related public transportation services are assumed to continue; i.e., airport limousines, local bus services, etc.

2. Airport Coach and JFK Express TSM—low cost Transportation Systems Management improvements to the current operation of both these systems.

3. Fulton Street/Boundary—more extensive station and track improvements to the JFK Express subway-bus service, including improved travelways for the connecting bus on the airport.

4. Queens Transitway—An exclusive travelway for buses, limousines and high-occupancy vehicles which would originate in central Queens, at the intersection of the Long Island Expressway and the Long Island Railroad, and then via the abandoned LIRR Rockaway Line right-of-way to Kennedy Airport, tying in with improved on-airport travelways into the Central Terminal Area.

Additionally, an examination of one or more combinations of these four alternatives could be explored. Reactions to this abbreviated list of alternatives, in terms of the desirability of further study, will be sought at the Scoping Meeting.

Potentially significant impacts of the alternatives on air quality, noise, vibration, and water quality shall be examined, including impacts during construction. Mitigating measures shall be explored for any adverse impacts

that might be identified. Other possible impacts on land use, urban development, ecologically sensitive areas, energy requirements, historic properties, etc. shall be examined in accordance with NEPA, CEQ and UMTA procedures.

The proposed evaluation criteria include transportation, environmental, social, economic and financial impact areas as required by current Federal (NEPA) and State (CEQA) environmental laws and current Federal CEQ, UMTA and FHWA guidelines. Reactions to this tentative list of evaluation criteria will also be sought at the Scoping Meeting, and criteria judged to be relevant to local decision-making that are not identified in this tentative list will also be included.

At the November 18th Scoping Meeting, staff will present the above information in more detail using maps and visual aids, as well as a plan for an active citizen involvement program, a work schedule and budget. The public and affected public agencies are invited to comment, either orally at the meeting or in writing for a period of 30 days following the meeting. Appropriate adjustments will be made following a review of these comments.

If there are any questions, please contact the UMTA Project Manager, Ms. Margarita Sainz de la Pena, Office of Planning Assistance, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590, telephone—(202) 426-2360, or the UMTA Regional Office Planning Representative, Mr. Brian Sterman, Suite 14-130, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, NY 10007, telephone—(212) 264-8162, or the Local Agency Project Director, Mr. Leon Goodman, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, One World Trade Center, 72 West, New York, NY 10048, telephone—(212) 466-8397.

Dated: October 29, 1980.

Robert H. McManus,
*Associate Administrator for Planning,
Management and Demonstrations.*

[FR Doc. 80-34228 Filed 10-31-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-M

Transportation Alternatives in New Jersey; Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement

In accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (83 Stat. 852) the Council on Environmental Quality's implementing regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration's Policy on Major Urban Mass Transportation Investments (published in the Federal Register on

September 22, 1976), the Urban Mass Transportation Administration hereby gives notice that an analysis of transportation alternatives in the Lindenwold-Berlin-Atco Corridor, Camden County, New Jersey, and preparation of the related Draft Environmental Impact Statement is to begin following two public meetings to be held on November 19, 1980, and December 3, 1980, at which time the scope and conduct of the analysis will be discussed. Members of the public and interested Federal, State and local agencies are invited to comment on the proposed scope of work, the alternatives to be studied, and the evaluation criteria to be used to arrive at a decision. Both scoping meetings will be held at 7:30 p.m. in the auditorium of the Overbrook Junior High School, Lindenwold, New Jersey.

The subject alternatives analysis will be conducted by the Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA) in cooperation with the New Jersey Department of Transportation, the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. Consultant support will also be used in this effort.

The Lindenwold-Berlin-Atco Corridor extends southeastward from the Lindenwold station of the Philadelphia-Lindenwold PATCO rapid transit line a distance of 7 miles to the vicinity of the interchange of US Route 30 and NJ Route 73 in Waterford Township. The axis of the corridor is an existing railroad right-of-way over which Conrail operates railroad commuter service between Atlantic Ocean shore points and the PATCO Lindenwold station. The influence area for the corridor is a band 10 miles in width centered on the corridor axis and bounded at the eastern end of the corridor by a semi-circle centered at the intersection of NJ Route 73 and the railroad right-of-way. This influence area contains approximately 110 square miles and in 1970 supported a population of 94,000. About 81% of the influence area and 91% of the area's inhabitants lie in Camden County, with the remainder in Burlington County. Of the 18 civil divisions of government situated wholly or substantially within the influence area, 16 are in Camden County.

The alternatives proposed for study include the following:

1. A no-build alternative designed to maintain the level of service provided by the existing transportation system. This alternative will serve as one basis for comparisons among the alternatives.
2. Region-wide carpooling, including economic incentives designed to promote higher auto occupancy.

3. Improvement of local bus service.
4. Provision of express bus service.
5. Initiation of demand-activated transportation service.
6. Initiation of railroad commuter service on the existing railroad line.
7. Construction of a light rail transit line.
8. Construction of an extension of the existing PATCO rail rapid transit system.

The project objectives and the evaluative criteria which will be derived from them include transportation, environmental, social, economic and financial considerations as required by current Federal and State environmental laws and current Federal CEQ, UMTA, and FHWA guidelines. Additional considerations of importance to local decision-making will also be included.

At the two scoping meetings, all of the information described above will be presented in greater detail using maps and visual aids. A plan for an active citizen participation program will also be described. Interested agencies, groups and private citizens will be invited to provide comments and questions, either orally at the meeting or in writing following the meeting. Appropriate adjustments to the work scope and the list of alternatives to be analyzed will be made accordingly.

If there are any questions, please contact the UMTA project manager, James M. Ryan, Office of Planning Assistance, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590, telephone (202) 426-2360, or the UMTA regional office planning representative, Mr. Alfred LeBeau, 434 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106, telephone (215) 597-4179 or the designated contact of the sponsoring agency, Mr. Paul T. Osisek, Delaware River Port Authority, Bridge Plaza, Camden, NJ 08101, telephone (215) 925-8780. Questions may also be directed to the consultant, George Beetle Company, at the Project Office in Berlin, NJ, during normal business hours or by telephone at (609) 772-1242.

Dated: October 29, 1980.

Robert H. McManus,
*Associate Administrator for Planning,
Management and Demonstrations.*

[FR Doc. 80-34139 Filed 10-31-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-M

Transportation Alternatives, Columbus North Corridor, Ohio; Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement

In accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (83 Stat. 852) the Council on Environmental Quality's implementing